

Today, I would like to talk about the current landscape of psychoanalysis. Up front I want to acknowledge my affiliation with the National Association for the Advancement of Psychoanalysis (NAAP). I am the past President and a board member of an organization that successfully advocates for the independence of psychoanalysis (what Freud called lay analysis) and for the independent psychoanalysts who are unable or unwilling to associate with organizations like the American Psychoanalytic Association. I am also the first President of IFPE who does not have a degree in a separate mental health field and my entry into the field comes from my training at an independent free standing psychoanalytic institute. This has never been a concern of IFPE almost since its founding, as the mission statement makes clear. I would like to quote from the mission statement.

Founded in 1991, the Federation is an inclusive organization whose membership is open to anyone with a self-defined and -proclaimed interest in the various discourses of psychoanalysis, such as clinical, academic, artistic, literary, or philosophical. The range of thinking that characterizes contemporary psychoanalysis has different perspectives in education, epistemology, ethics, and theory. These perspectives speak to the many equally meaningful interpretations of psychoanalytic discourse. The Federation provides the opportunity for interpretive encounters with these richly diverse and creative perspectives of the world, people, life, and psychoanalysis. A defining dimension of the Federation's uniqueness as an organization is its inclusiveness of this diversity of thinking, the threads of which are woven, at once, into the philosophical fabric of its governance structure and annual interdisciplinary conferences.

It is this ecumenical philosophy and practice that has made IFPE so attractive to all of its membership and provided the basis for the openness and creativity that permeates through our conference.

I have titled my talk, **I had a dream**

wish that included the idea that all psychoanalysts are created equal., Yet I have had to confront the hard-nosed reality that some psychoanalysts feel as if they were created more equal than others. But I had a desire to become a psychoanalyst, not a physician, not a psychologist nor a social worker, but a psychoanalyst . This desire had arisen in me, probably in a way similar to a lot of you here. It developed over a matter of years while I was in treatment (a treatment that eventually became my training analysis) and very much arose out of that treatment as I experienced the effects of a four and then five time a week analysis. I heard about a place in New York City where I could train, without having a degree in some other mental health area, an institute whose philosophy was and is that psychoanalysis is an independent profession, and not a subspecialty of something else. That place is NPAP, started 60 years ago by Theodore Reik, about whom Freud had written his seminal essay, In Defense of Lay Analysis. But more about that later.

When I began training, I had no idea of the history of internal fighting and conflicts that pervaded the American psychoanalytic landscape. Rather when I matriculated and joined the Theodore Reik Consultation Center, I was thrilled to begin seeing patients at the rate of \$8/ session. And my first full year in practice under supervision, I was so proud to have netted a total of \$9 after paying all my expenses and fees associated with training.

It was only in time that I became more cognizant of the checkered American psychoanalytic landscape. In fact it began with the formation of the New York Psychoanalytic Society in 1911 by A. A. Brill, recognized as the first American

psychoanalyst, who restricted membership to those who were medically trained. His goal was to make psychoanalysis a sub-specialty of psychiatry despite the protestation of Freud and other European analysts. Over the course of the next two decades several psychoanalytic societies developed in Washington- Baltimore, Chicago and Boston, and in 1932, they joined with New York to form the American Psychoanalytic Association.

According to Paul Mosher and Arnold Richards in their essay, “The History of Membership and Certification in the APsaA: Old Demons, New Debate”, in the 1930’s the Association was dealing with “the enduring question of lay analysis” and in 1938 introduced a new rule that only physicians who had completed a psychiatric residency at an approved institution could become members. Michael Schroter, in his essay, “The Early History of Lay Analysis”, writes in his footnote to a quote from Jung to Freud in 1912 complaining about a non-medical analyst that “there are just enough patients for ourselves (meaning medical analysts)..” It can be safely assumed that economic concerns played a critical role in most stages of the controversy over lay analysis. Since, however, they were rarely admitted openly but rather tended to be veiled by statements of principle, their impact is difficult to assess.

Freud, himself addresses the issue in a 1929 postscript to his essay, “In Defense of Lay Analysis” (1927), where he states,

the important question is not whether an analyst possesses a medical diploma but whether he has had the special training necessary for the practice of Analysis.

Theodore Reik, about whom this essay was written, came to the United States in the wake of the Second World War and approached the new American Psychoanalytic Association (ApsaA) formed in 1946. They refused to give him full membership status

but said that he could teach and they would look the other way if he practiced analysis on a limited basis. If he had accepted, it would have probably sealed the fate for psychoanalysis in the United States, as there would have been no place for the training of independent, non-medical psychoanalysts. Instead he founded NPAP in May of 1948, which has just celebrated its 60th year in existence.

The attitude of ApsaA continued to follow from the dogmatic position of exclusion propounded by Brill throughout his lifetime, which he summarized as follows in 1942:

This leads me to the non-medical practitioners, to the so-called lay-analysts who began to invade the field of psychotherapy about 20 years ago. Despite the fact that I have known some highly educated lay-analysts, conscientious men and women, whose theoretical knowledge of psychoanalysis leaves nothing to be desired, I feel that as the problem now stands they should not be allowed to practice psychoanalysis or for that matter, any form of psychotherapy.

What could he have meant other than to confirm Schroters speculation about the financial motivation as Brill's statement is **not even**

Then in 1985 four psychologists, backed by the American Psychological Association, filed a law suit against APsaA and The New York Psychoanalytic, challenging Brill's imposed doctrine that only medical physicians could be trained at their institutes. The law suit was settled in 1989 and the Institute reluctantly agreed to train psychologists. Just two years later, the previously warring parties, ApsaA and the APA, joined the American Academy of Psychoanalysis and the National Committee on Psychoanalysis in Clinical Social Work to form the Consortium, presumably to counter the efforts of NAAP. It was also in 1991 that with seed money from Division 39 of the APA, IFPE was formed with the initial intention of creating it as an accrediting body in psychoanalysis. But within a couple of years, the membership of IFPE rejected this direction and moved towards what is the present day IFPE, the open and inclusive organization devoted to psychoanalytic education.

During the 90's the battle was continually fueled by competing accreditation groups, both at a state and national level. NAAP had its counterpart ABAP, the American Board for the Accreditation of Psychoanalysis, and the consortium had ACPE, the Accreditation Council for Psychoanalytic Education. Thus the war over inclusion or exclusion was waged on the battlefield of standards. The issue of frequency, long a contentious bone in the battle, became the centerpiece of the war. It was further compounded by the International Psychoanalytic Association opening up to several non-ApsaA institutes in the United States. NPAP was one of the institutes invited and I remember the arguments we had on the NPAP Board over the main sticking point, four times a week required frequency (NPAP has long had a three times a week requirement). Ultimately we bowed out as we realized that the conflict could have made

the institute implode. My personal belief about frequency is that three or four times a week is beneficial, but this is based on my own anecdotal experience. But that being said, with my experiences at IFPE with colleagues who are Jungian or Adlerian or Modern or others who work one time a week and persuasively discuss their psychoanalytic work, how can I assert that my analytic experience is better than theirs? Just last week on a panel at the second Future of Psychoanalytic Education conference in New York, two candidates responded to the question of frequency in the context of the distinction between psychoanalysis and psychoanalytic psychotherapy that their generation of candidates has little or no interest in the question of frequency at all. Rather their interest was in addressing the patient's needs and not fitting them into a regimented structure. The two candidates were from IPTAR, one of the non-ApsaA institutes to become a member of the International, that requires four times a week treatment. Perhaps we should hear and heed what this generation of candidates is saying.

I believe that psychoanalysis is not defined by any particular tool we do or do not use, be it frequency or the couch or whatever. Rather it is defined by a methodology and a way of thinking that emphasizes the unconscious. And I challenge all of the psychoanalysts in the audience to consider whether you are a different analyst if the patient come once, twice three or more times or whether your thinking as a psychoanalyst remains the same and consistent. But this is a discussion for another time so I'd like to return to the psychoanalytic landscape.

In 2002 it changed dramatically. In that year the State of New York passed mental health legislation creating licenses for four professions, mental health

counselors, creative art therapists, family therapists and psychoanalysts. With this the state of New York recognized psychoanalysis as a independent profession and as of today there are more than 800 licensed psychoanalysts in New York State. I was the 46th to receive a license. I was not in favor of the licensing legislation prior to its passage. As a lawyer I was well aware that with governmental intervention comes regulation and these are not always consistent with how the profession has operated previously as rhe state's interest in generally defined by the protection of the public. Yet I was aware that in at least 17 states, I would not be able to practice without first having a license in some other mental health area. What the New York licensing experience has taught me is that the best solution might be a basic psychoanalytic psychotherapy license with the proviso that anyone who is appropriately trained as a psychoanalyst (for example at a psychoanalytic institute) would be able to practice psychoanalysis. This would even the playing field and no one could claim ownership over psychoanalysis, but still the states would not be intervening in the training process as the public would be adequately protected by all parties having a license.

But with licensing in New York did come innumerable regulatory problems that challenged the free standing institutes that in the extreme questioned their ability to keep existing and at the very least, changed how they operate and are structured. I will briefly discuss two examples, the question of clinical settings and the analytic fee structures.

Apparently no one who drafted the legislation took notice of the unique structure of analytic training in that the clinical experience has traditionally been gained by the candidate in a private practice setting simultaneously with the educational experience.

The state said this could not continue in a private practice setting and only approved clinical settings within the institute would be permissible for gaining the required experience. Of course the state was correct, as how could a candidate who is unlicensed maintain a private office to train for a profession that now required a license? This left many institutes in a quandary as they didn't even have an actual physical facility. Only through a dogged persistence and steadfast desire to survive have they come up with creative solutions. But in the last six months, we have seen that the regulation on settings has been applied to have broader implications as it now extends to licensed Masters of Social Work who are being restricted in counting their supervised experience within the psychoanalytic institute towards their hours for the clinical social work license and who have now been forced into their own negotiations with the state.

The second issue, the question of payment of candidates' fees for their required analysis demonstrated just how the state bureaucrats had no understanding of the necessities of training in psychoanalysis. Maintaining that since the required hours for analysis was included under the education section in the statute, the state contended that the psychoanalysis of candidates was therefore (and I quote) "no different than a biology lab" in a university curriculum and thus the fees were part of the tuition and had to be paid directly from the candidate to the institute.

In an unprecedented fashion, the institutes organized together (26 different organizations) and objected to the state's regulatory interpretation. After almost two years of back and forth discussion, the state changed its position to allow the fees for the analysis to remain private between the analyst and the candidate. It was an amazing show of solidarity that demonstrated what we could do as a profession if we

can only put our differences on the back burner and use our similarities as an impetus to pool our resources.

But this has not been the case in the current battlefield that exists here in Massachusetts. Once again all the parties are mobilized and pouring money and time into what I will now call the inclusionary/ exclusionary matrix and the fight over legislation. I do not intend to go into the merits of this ordeal; rather I want to make a plea for an end to the turf wars. Psychoanalysis is at an all time low in the public's mind. The image of psychoanalysis as a moribund, inert endeavor is widespread and we as a profession do nothing to counter this image. Rather we involve ourselves in internal turf wars wasting valuable time, energy and resources. It is as if we are in the middle of the Titanic in a boxing ring fighting a boxing match. Who cares who wins? The ship is going down.

I still have a dream, and that is that psychoanalysis regains its place in the society as a viable force, not only with respect to the work we do with patients, but also with respect to our place in the social and political fabric of the society. With its ecumenical policies and tradition, I hope that IFPE can be a facilitator in this by continuing to promote the best and creative within and without of the psychoanalytic community. I believe that this is only possible if we put aside our own petty interests and internal infighting and acknowledge all of our right to exist in the psychoanalytic landscape and then achieve some form of coexistence for the greater good. I hope my dream doesn't turn into our worst nightmare.